

REMARKS

The specification has been amended to reflect that the parent application (Serial No. 09/648,408) from which this application claims priority under 35 U.S.C. §120, also in turn claims priority under 35 U.S.C. §119(e) from U.S. Provisional Patent Application Serial No. 60/150,611 filed on August 24, 1999.

Claims 1-19 were pending in this application. Claims 1-4, 7-11, 13-17, and 19 were rejected and claims 5, 6, 12, and 18 were objected to in the Office Action dated December 17, 2003.

Claims 1-4, 7-11, 13-17, and 19 are hereby canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 5, 6, 12, and 18 are hereby rewritten as independent claims including all limitations of the base claim (claim 1) that is now being canceled. No new matter is introduced by the amendments.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements (IDSs) submitted on 12/29/00, 1/9/01, 4/8/03, and 9/17/03.

The Examiner is hereby requested to also consider the IDS filed on December 1, 2000 with the patent application as well as the 5th Supplemental IDS filed on October 20, 2003.

Drawings

The Examiner objected to the informal drawings filed on December 1, 2000 because they contain black surface shading and the margins do not comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §1.84. Applicants had submitted corrected informal drawings containing Figures 1-20 on February 28, 2001. However, the drawings filed on February 28, 2001 were not mentioned in the Office Action dated December 17, 2003.

Concurrently with this Amendment, Applicant hereby submits a Letter to the Chief Draftsperson enclosing formal drawings containing Figures 1-20 replacing all of the informal drawings (Figures 1-20) submitted on February 28, 2001. The formal drawings do not contain black surface shading, and their margins comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §1.84. Therefore, the objections to the drawings are now overcome.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 5, 6, 10, 15, 16, 17, and 19 as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Since claims 2, 10, 15, 16, 17, and 19 are hereby canceled, the rejections of these claims 2, 10, 15, 16, 17, and 19 are now overcome.

Claims 5 and 6 were rejected as being indefinite because they recite the limitation “a service provider” when “a service provider” was previously recited in canceled claim 1. Claims 5 and 6 were rewritten in independent form to include all limitations of canceled claim 1, and “a service provider” in the part that was originally in claims 5 and 6 prior to the amendment was changed to “the service provider.”

Thus, the rejections of claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph are now overcome.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-4, 7-11, 13-17, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,078,906 (Huberman). Claims 1-4, 7-11, 13-17, and 19 are hereby canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Thus, the rejections of claims 1-4, 7-11, 13-17, and 19 are now overcome.


The Examiner indicated that claims 5, 6, 12, and 18 were objected to as being dependent from a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 5, 6, 12, and 18 are hereby rewritten as independent claims including all limitations of canceled claim 1.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims 5, 6, 12, and 18 are in condition for allowance. Favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Beerud D. Sheth

Dated: March 11, 2004

By: 

Jae Won Song, 37 C.F.R. §10.9(b)
Fenwick & West LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (650) 335-7164
Fax.: (650) 938-5200